



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
PAUL RANDALL,  
Defendant.

Case No. 2:25-mj-03689  
ORDER OF DETENTION

On June 27, 2025, Defendant Paul Randall made his initial appearance on the Indictment filed in this matter. He was represented at the detention hearing by retained counsel Reuven Cohen. Mr. Randall disputed the recommendation of detention made by the Pretrial Services Report. A hearing was held, and the Court heard argument from both parties.

The Court makes the following findings:

1        ☒ On motion by the Government [18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(2)] in a case  
2 allegedly involving a serious risk that the defendant will flee.

3        ☒ On motion by the Government [18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(2)] in a case  
4 allegedly involving a serious risk that the defendant will obstruct or attempt to  
5 obstruct justice, or threaten, injure, or intimidate a prospective witness or juror, or  
6 attempt to do so.

7        The Court concludes that the Government is entitled to a detention hearing  
8 under § 3142(f)(2), but only based on risk of flight. The Court finds, based on the  
9 limited information presented at the detention hearing, that obstruction of justice  
10 does not apply. As to risk of flight, however, the Government has met its burden that  
11 it is entitled to a detention hearing. Specifically, as described in greater detail below,  
12 Mr. Randall has egregiously violated conditions of bond and of supervision in the  
13 past. He faces significant exposure in this case, and there are unaccounted-for  
14 monies that would fund attempts to flee the jurisdiction. Given Mr. Randall's age  
15 and health issues, his assets, and his brazen violations of conditions in the past, the  
16 Court believes that there is enough of risk of flight to support a finding that the  
17 Government has shown it is entitled to a detention hearing.

18        The Government is not entitled to a rebuttable presumption that no condition  
19 or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as  
20 required and the safety of any person or the community [18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(2)].

21        The Court finds that no condition or combination of conditions will  
22 reasonably assure: ☐ the appearance of the defendant as required.

23                ☒ the safety of any person or the community.

24        The Court has considered: (a) the nature and circumstances of the offense(s)  
25 charged, including whether the offense is a crime of violence, a Federal crime of  
26 terrorism, or involves a minor victim or a controlled substance, firearm, explosive,  
27 or destructive device; (b) the weight of evidence against the defendant; (c) the history  
28 and characteristics of the defendant; and (d) the nature and seriousness of the danger

1 to any person or the community. [18 U.S.C. § 3142(g)] The Court also considered  
2 the report and recommendation of the U.S. Pretrial Services Agency.

3 The Court bases its conclusions on the following:

4 Mr. Randall has been charged and convicted of fraud-related conduct going  
5 back to the early 1990s. The two most recent convictions are most relevant here: Mr.  
6 Randall was convicted in 2012 for conduct relating to illegal kickbacks for referrals  
7 of workers' compensation patients in 2009-2010. According to the plea agreement  
8 in that case, Randall's fraud scheme caused a loss of 2.5 to 7 million dollars. Mr.  
9 Randall was on bond awaiting sentencing in that case when he began a new and  
10 different kickback-related fraud scheme. When this new fraud scheme was  
11 uncovered, Mr. Randall was ordered detained on the first case. He was ultimately  
12 sentenced to 15 months in custody on that case.

13 After sentencing on the first case, in 2020, Mr. Randall was charged in a  
14 second case for the conduct committed while he was on bond. Mr. Randall was  
15 released on bond in the second case. He pleaded guilty to that charge in April 2022.  
16 One month after he entered that guilty plea, he began engaging in the conduct that  
17 is alleged in the instant case—a scheme that is alleged to have resulted in Medi-Cal  
18 paying out \$178 million dollars in fraudulent claims. The Government alleges that  
19 Mr. Randall personally received over \$32 million in fraud proceeds from this third  
20 scheme and avers that there remain significant fraud proceeds that are not accounted  
21 for.

22 Having at least once, and allegedly twice, executed fraud schemes while on  
23 bond and awaiting sentence, Mr. Randall has demonstrated that he is not able to  
24 comply with conditions that could be set that would mitigate the economic danger  
25 posed to the community. Having made that finding, the Court need not  
26  
27  
28

1 independently consider whether Mr. Randall poses a risk of nonappearance or  
2 whether conditions could be set that would adequately mitigate that risk.

3 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the defendant be detained until trial. The  
4 defendant will be committed to the custody of the Attorney General for confinement  
5 in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or  
6 serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant will be  
7 afforded reasonable opportunity for private consultation with counsel. On order of  
8 a Court of the United States or on request of any attorney for the Government, the  
9 person in charge of the corrections facility in which defendant is confined will  
10 deliver the defendant to a United States Marshal for the purpose of an appearance in  
11 connection with a court proceeding. [18 U.S.C. § 3142(i)]

12 Dated: June 30, 2025

13 /s/

14 BRIANNA FULLER MIRCHEFF  
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28